



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

inclusion of a number of other topics which, while probably legitimately included in a full treatment of principles of education, are here not sufficiently expanded to make the book a very good text, unless it be used only as an introduction to topics more fully treated by lectures and further reading. The chapters on "The Biological Bases of Education," "The Agencies That Educate," and "The Psychological Basis of Teaching" are particularly inadequate. The treatment of the biological side is too fragmentary to serve the needs of even a beginning class. So also it would seem that the psychological side should have been omitted, as falling properly in educational psychology, or else expanded beyond the bare outline of thirty-seven pages accorded to it here. The reviewer wonders also whether it is worth while to discuss the evolution of the school if only eight pages can be devoted to it.

The author devotes considerable space to a discussion of the aim of education, which closes with a useful chapter on formal discipline containing a fair summary of the current views upon the subject. Mr. Ruediger finds in the biological concept of "adjustment" the best statement of the end of education. "Education as adjustment," he says, "means fundamentally three things. It means intelligent mastery over one's environment, increased harmony with it, and increased appreciation of it." As the concept of adjustment is interpreted here and in other places in the book it is seen to have a connotation quite different from what it has in biology, and one wonders whether it would not serve the purposes of educational theory better to drop the term as inappropriate within the complex sphere of conscious evolution.

The book is well but not strikingly written. There are suggestive questions and exercises at the ends of the chapters. The discussions raise many problems, an adequate examination of which would pass far beyond the limits of a brief review. As we have pointed out, it seems to us that the most serious criticism upon the book is that it attempts to cover too much ground for its limited space and hence tends in places to be scrappy. Part of the difficulty, of course, inheres in the fact that there is not as yet any unanimity among educational thinkers as to the proper content of the principles of education. After all, it is perhaps best for each writer to include in his work all the topics which he regards as appropriate, leaving the decision to the public.

*The Child and His Religion.* By GEORGE E. DAWSON. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. ix+124. \$0.75; postage 7 cents.

This little book contains four essays bearing upon the general subject of religious education: "Interest as a Measure of Values," "The Natural Religion of Children," "Children's Interest in the Bible" (originally published in the Pedagogical Seminary, July, 1900), and "The Problem of Religious Education." We shall here confine our attention to the last section.

After the analogy of secular education, the aim of religious education is said to be "religious adjustment to a progressive environment." Both religious and secular education are concerned with an identical environment, and hence the two types of education are to be distinguished on the side of the type of adjustment. All of man's natural and social environment is capable of being viewed religiously, and it is the specific function of the religious teacher to cultivate in

the child this point of view. According to the author, the prevailing attitude is that religion has nothing to do with the natural—that God manifests himself in this world by exceptions rather than by means of natural law. We doubt whether, even if this be the case, it has the significance attributed to it. However that may be, the author holds that the first prerequisite of religious education is that children be taught that all nature is the expression of the divine. As a generalization this is very good, but one wishes that the author had gone more into practical details. Even as an account of general principles it is certainly inadequate. The author refers to the kindergarten and the Young Men's Christian Association as illustrating the practical application of his ideal, but the illustration is hardly satisfying. What is the religious use to which all knowledge must be put? Religious ends are to take the place of secular ends in the interpretation of the world. There seems to be a contradiction in the argument, for in an earlier portion of the book the author held that all science is implicitly religious. It would seem to be a legitimate deduction from this conception of science that all scientific training would be at the same time religious training. It seems, moreover, that the author's conception of religious education is predominantly intellectualistic, although he refers briefly to the feeling and motor responses as essential.

The aim of religious education as stated above may be criticized in a friendly way. There does not seem to be any real relation between the concept of adjustment as here outlined and the actual plan as outlined by the author. There is a certain suggestiveness in the concept of adjustment, but it has been largely overworked. It only very inadequately describes the process of growth in things intellectual, aesthetic, and moral. One who uses such a concept to describe these higher processes almost always tends to distort or narrow the facts to fit it. Now our interest in education is, not to illustrate any *a priori* theory of what education is, but to get a working understanding of the process itself; and we should studiously avoid all types of terminology which may tend to blind us to the real nature of the process under consideration. In this case, "adjustment to a progressive environment" is hopelessly vague. Just what sort of change must be effected in a child that it may be adjusted to a progressive rather than to a static environment? The statement throws no light upon the nature of the process in question. Certainly one must be capable of progressing along religious lines; but is this complex religious life, finely attuned to life's deeper values and capable not only of realizing them in action but also of growing into fuller and deeper appreciation of these values, adequately described as adjustment to a progressive environment? To cast the statement into such a form preserves a biological analogy; but does it not miss the quality really significant in the higher plane of development? This is not the place to develop or to defend a more adequate formulation, which, however, we believe to be possible.

IRVING KING

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA